In conclusion, we have argued that the deeming procedure may present a political question unsuited for judicial review, and, thus, that Congress would not be subject to judicial review. We have considered, on the other hand, that the courts may find that they are not precluded from exercising authority to review this proposal. If the proposal is reviewed by the court, and even if it is not, we have presented an argument leading to sustaining the deeming procedure as not in violation of the principle that a bill in order to become law must be passed in identical versions by the House of Representatives and the Senate. Because of the lack of available precedent, we cannot argue that any of the three versions of the argument is indisputably correct. Indeed, there are questions about all three. In the end, Congress must exercise a constitutional judgment when deciding on passage of the proposal.

What Mr. Killiam has said—and it is a very in-depth and in some ways esoteric discussion—various cases have appeared before the Supreme Court, and he argues at the end of his dissertation that there are arguments that lead in favor of the constitutionality of separate enrollment, but it could be subject to judicial review.

And his last sentence, I think, is probably the most operative, where he said:

In the end, Congress must exercise a constitutional judgment when deciding on passage of the proposal.

I also say to those who are concerned about the constitutionality of this issue, the Simon amendment—and a similar amendment was adopted by the House of Representatives—will call for expedited judicial review. We will find out. I am not using that as an argument for somebody who feels there is a clear constitutionality problem here and believes it is unconstitutional to therefore vote for this legislation just because it is going to receive judicial review. But I am saying to those who may have some doubts that this issue will be resolved and resolved in a very short period of time.

I also want to take a few minutes to quote from Judith Best, who has been a well-known expert on this particular issue. It is a very short quote. This part of her dissertation, entitled ''The Constitutional Objection.''

The objection is that the proposal is unconstitutional—

Meaning separate enrollment is unconstitutional.

because it would change the Constitution, specifically the veto power, by act of Congress alone. The response is as follows: Article I, section 5 of the Constitution permits this procedure. Nothing in Article I, section 7 is violated by this procedure. Under this proposal, all bills must be presented to the President. He may sign or veto all bills. He must return vetoed bills with his objections. Congress may override any veto with a two-thirds majority of each House. Under Article I, section 5, Congress possesses the power to define a bill. Congress certainly believes that it possesses this power, since it alone has been doing so since the first bill was presented to the first President in the first Congress. If this construction of Article I, section 5 is correct, the definition of a bill is a political question and not justiciable. Prominent on the surface of any case held to involve a political question is found a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment to issues to a coordinate political department. A textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to the legislature as found in each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. Congress may define as a bill a package of distinct programs and unrelated items to be separate bills. Either Congress has a right to define a bill or it does not. Either this proposal is constitutional or the recent practice of Congress informing omnibus bills containing unrelated programs and nongermane items is constitutionally challengeable. If the latter, the President would be well advised to bring such suit against the next omnibus bill.

I think, basically, Professor Best lays it out there. The Congress has a right to determine what a bill is. The Congress may define as a bill a package of distinct programs and unrelated items. And her argument, which I support, is that therefore the Congress of the United States can define a single enrollment which was part of a package as a bill as well.

But we will probably have much more debate on that in the couple of days ahead. I want to express again my admiration for Senator BYRD, the Senator from West Virginia, for his erudite and compelling and well-informed arguments. I watched a great deal of the debate today between the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from West Virginia. I think it was edifying, and I think many of my colleagues had the opportunity to observe them. I think most of the arguments concerning constitutionality, enrollment, and other aspects of the line-item veto were well described. I, again, express my admiration for the talent and enormous knowledge that the Senator from West Virginia possesses.

Again, I want to emphasize again that a lot of time has been taken, and more time will be taken on the floor on this issue. This is a fundamental and structural change in the way we do business. I believe it deserves thorough ventilation and debate. At the same time, I believe we can probably bring it to a close. I thank the Senator.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, Senator BRADLEY be recognized to offer an amendment on tax expenditures on which there be the following time limitation prior to a motion to table, with no second-degree amendments to be in order prior to the motion to table: 30 minutes under the control of Senator BRADLEY, 15 minutes under the control of Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 35

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I am pleased to transmit to you the Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1993.

The Foundation supports research and education in every State of the Union. Its programs provide an international science and technology link to sustain cooperation and advance this Nation's leadership role.

This report shows how the Foundation puts science and technology to work for a sustainable future—for our economic, environmental, and national security.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 1995.*

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 36

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

To the Congress of the United States:

1. On August 19, 1994, in Executive Order No. 12924, I declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*) and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, I continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977 (as amended by Executive Order No. 12755 of March 12, 1991), Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990 (subsequently revoked by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994), and Executive Order No. 12851 of June 11, 1993.

2. I issued Executive Order No. 12924 pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including, but not limited to, IEEPA. At that

time, I also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). Section 204 of IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*) requires that the President, within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration. This report, covering the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12924, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the system of export controls, including antiboycott provisions, contained in the Export Administration Regulations. In administering these controls, the Department has acted under a policy of conforming actions under Executive Order No. 12924 to those required under the Export Administration Act, insofar as appropriate.

4. Since my last report to the Congress, there have been several significant developments in the area of export controls:

BILATERAL COOPERATION/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

—As part of the Administration's continuing effort to encourage other countries to implement effective export controls to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as certain sensitive technologies, the Department of Commerce and other agencies conducted a range of discussions with a number of foreign countries, including governments in the Baltics, Central and Eastern Europe, the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, the Pacific Rim, and China. Licensing requirements were liberalized for exports to Argentina, South Korea, and Taiwan, responding in part to their adoption of improved export control procedures.

AUSTRALIA GROUP

—The Department of Commerce issued regulations to remove controls on certain chemical weapon stabilizers that are not controlled by the Australia Group, a multilateral regime dedicated to stemming the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. This change became effective October 19, 1994. In that same regulatory action, the Department also published a regulatory revision that reflects an Australia Group decision to adopt a multi-tiered approach to control of certain mixtures containing chemical precursors. The new regulations extend General License G–DEST treatment to certain categories of such mixtures.

NUCLEAR SUPPLIERS GROUP (NSG)

—NSG members are examining the present dual-use nuclear control list to both remove controls no longer warranted and to rewrite control language to better reflect nuclear proliferation concerns. A major item for revision involves machine tools, as the current language was accepted on an interim basis until agreement on more specific language could be reached.

—The Department of Commerce has implemented license denials for NSG-controlled items as part of the ''no-undercut'' provision. Under this provision, denial notifications received from NSG member countries obligate other member nations not to approve similar transactions until they have consulted with the notifying party, thus reducing the possibilities for undercutting such denials.

MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME (MTCR)

—Effective September 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce revised the control language for MTCR items on the Commerce Control List, based on the results of the last MTCR plenary. The revisions reflect advances in technology and clarifications agreed to multilaterally.

—On October 4, 1994, negotiations to resolve the 1993 sanctions imposed on China for MTCR violations involving missile-related trade with Pakistan were successfully concluded. The United States lifted the Category II sanctions effective November 1, in exchange for a Chinese commitment not to export ground-to-ground Category I missiles to any destination.

—At the October 1994 Stockholm plenary, the MTCR made public the fact of its ''no-undercut'' policy on license denials. Under this multilateral arrangement, denials notifications received from MTCR members are honored by other members for similar export license applications. Such a coordinated approach enhances U.S. missile nonproliferation goals and precludes other member nations from approving similar transactions without prior consultation.

MODIFICATIONS IN CONTROLS ON EMBARGOED DESTINATIONS

—Effective August 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce restricted the types of commodities eligible for shipment to Cuba under the provisions of General License GIFT. Only food, medicine, clothing, and other human needs items are eligible for this general license.

—The embargo against Haiti was lifted on October 16, 1994. That embargo had been under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury. Export license authority reverted to the Department of Commerce upon the termination of the embargo.

REGULATORY REFORM

—In February 1994, the Department of Commerce issued a *Federal Register* notice that invited public comment on ways to improve the Export Administration Regulations. The project's objective is ''to make the rules and procedures for the control of exports simpler and easier to understand and apply.'' This project is not intended to be a vehicle to implement substantive change in the policies or procedures of export administration, but rather to make those policies and procedures simpler and clearer to the exporting community. Reformulating and simplifying the Export Administration Regulations is an important priority, and significant progress has been made over the last 6 months in working toward completion of this comprehensive undertaking.

EXPORT ENFORCEMENT

—Over the last 6 months, the Department of Commerce continued its vigorous enforcement of the Export Administration Act and the Export Administration Regulations through educational outreach, license application screening, spot checks, investigations, and enforcement actions. In the last 6 months, these efforts resulted in civil penalties, denials of export privileges, criminal fines, and imprisonment. Total fines amounted to over $12,289,000 in export control and antiboycott compliance cases, including criminal fines of nearly $9,500,000 while 11 parties were denied export privileges.

—Teledyne Fined $12.9 Million and a Teledyne Division Denied Export Privileges for Export Control Violations: On January 26 and January 27, Teledyne Industries, Inc. of Los Angeles, agreed to a settlement of criminal and administrative charges arising from illegal export activity in the mid-1980's by its Teledyne Wah Chang division, located in Albany, Oregon. The settlement levied criminal fines and civil penalties on the firm totaling $12.9 million and imposed a denial of export privileges on Teledyne Wah Chang.

The settlement is the result of a 4-year investigation by the Office of Export Enforcement and the U.S. Customs Service. United States Attorneys offices in Miami and Washington, D.C., coordinated the investigation. The investigation determined that during the mid-1980's, Teledyne illegally exported nearly 270 tons of zirconium that was used to manufacture cluster bombs for Iraq.

As part of the settlement, the Department restricted the export privileges of Teledyne's Wah Chang division; the division will have all export privileges denied for 3 months, with the remaining portion of the 3-year denial period suspended.

—Storm Kheem Pleads Guilty to Nonproliferation and Sanctions Violations: On January 27, Storm Kheem pled guilty in Brooklyn, New York, to charges that he violated export control regulations barring U.S. persons from contributing to Iraq's missile program. Kheem arranged for the shipment of foreign-source ammonium perchlorate, a highly explosive chemical used in manufacturing rocket fuel, from the People's Republic of China to Iraq via Amman, Jordan, without obtaining the required validated license from the Department of Commerce for arranging the shipment. Kheem's case represents the first conviction of a person for violating section 778.9 of the Export Administration Regulations, which restricts proliferation-related activities of ''U.S. persons.'' Kheem also pled guilty to charges of violating the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls where largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are anticipated to be $19,681,000 most of which represents program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personal and overhead expenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 1995.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Schaefer, one of its assistant legislative clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1. An act to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations; and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 21, 1995, she had presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bill:

S. 1. An act to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations; and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 20, 1995, the following report was submitted on March 20, 1995, during the recess of the Senate:

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 831. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain on sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104–16).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 580. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to control illegal immigration to the United States, reduce incentives for illegal immigration, reform asylum procedures, strengthen criminal penalties for the smuggling of aliens, and reform other procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 581. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal those provisions of Federal law that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 582. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that certain voluntary disclosures of violations of Federal laws made pursuant to an environmental audit shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence during a Federal judicial or administrative proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 583. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation and coastwise trade endorsement for two vessels; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 584. A bill to authorize the award of the Purple Heart to persons who were prisoners of war on or before April 25, 1962; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 585. A bill to protect the rights of small entities subject to investigative or enforcement action by agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 586. A bill to eliminate the Department of Agriculture and certain agricultural programs, to transfer other agricultural programs to an agribusiness block grant program and other Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KYL, Mr. EXON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FORD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BOND, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. BREAUX):

S.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant Congress and the States the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 580. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to control illegal immigration to the United States, reduce incentives for illegal immigration, reform asylum procedures, strengthen criminal penalties for the smuggling of aliens, and reform other procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, and now send to the desk, the Illegal Immigration Control and Enforcement Act of 1995. This bill incorporates many of the concepts in the immigration package that I introduced in the last session of Congress. New proposals have been added, however, after consultation with many, including California's law enforcement officials and others interested in curbing illegal immigration.

Mr. President, I offer this legislation not to compete with Senator SIMPSON's S. 269, which he introduced on January 24, but rather to complement it. Little in this bill is duplicative of Senator SIMPSON's legislation. I am convinced that, combined, these two bills could offer a strong, straightforward program to stop illegal immigration.

There simply is no time to lose. The crisis of illegal immigration continues in California and throughout the Nation.